



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/715,308	11/17/2000	Michael J. Gibbs	H0001797	7623

128 7590 05/23/2002

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.  
101 COLUMBIA ROAD  
P O BOX 2245  
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

MARC COLEMAN, MARTHE Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Applicati n No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/715,308	GIBBS ET AL.	
	<b>Examin r</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Marthe Y Marc-Coleman	3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-29 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 11-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/17/00 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____    | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a first office action in response to Application No. 09/715,308 filed on November 17, 2000 in which claims **1-29** are presented for examination.

#### *Drawings*

2. Figure 1 which illustrates prior art should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art" in order to clarify what is the applicant's invention. From the background and brief description of the drawings, it appears that Figure 1 should be labeled "**Prior Art**" (see MPEP 608.02(g) ). Correction or clarification is required.

#### *Abstract*

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. **The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims**, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The

disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," **"The present invention", etc.**

#### **Abstract Objections**

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the use of legal terminology such as **the present invention, the present invention discloses should be avoided**. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

#### **Specification**

5. The specification is objected to because of the following informality for which the following suggestion is proposed:

On page 2 line 16, "the operate the aircraft" should be replaced by - - the operator of the aircraft- -;

On page 3, line 3, "fight crews" should be replaced by - -flight crews- -.

On page 5, line 12, "figure further illustrates" should be replaced by - - figures further illustrate - -;

Correction is required.

#### **Claim Objections**

6. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Part (a) of claim 1, line 6, "entry device" should be replace by - - entry means- -;

Part (a) of claim 1 line 7, "the display" should be replaced by - - the monitor- -.

Appropriate correction is required.

7. Claims 3, 8, 9, 10 and 27 are objected to and need to be started with the next alphabetical in order to avoid confusion. Since claim 3 depends on claim 2 which in turns depends on claim 1 and independent claim 1 already contains a part a), in order to avoid confusion, Applicant is suggested to preserve the numbering of the claim parts. Appropriate correction is required.

8. Claims 7 and 15 are objected to because of the following informality:

The language of claim 7 is confusing. It is suggested that the Applicant delete "and otherwise corresponding," from the claim.

Correction is required.

#### **Renumbering of Claims**

9. The present application has been filed with two "claim 9". As per rule 1.126, the second "claim 9" has been renumbered as "claim 10". All the succeeding claims (10-28) have been also renumbered as claims 11-29, respectively. In this office action, the claims will be referred as being renumbered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 2-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**In regard to claim 2,** " the aircraft operator" lacks proper antecedent basis in claim 2, line 2. Applicant is suggested to replace "the aircraft operator" by "an operator of the aircraft.

The remaining claims which depend on claim 2 are also rejected based on their dependency.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-8 and 11-19, as renumbered, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnett (U.S. Patent No. 5,416,705) in view of Nakhla (U.S. Patent No. 5,526,265).

In regard to claim 1, Barnett discloses a method for entering data into an aircraft avionic flight management system having a computer means (**MCPU 30**) (see col. 2 lines 20-25) the computer means communicating with a monitor (**display 14, Fig. 3**) at least one data source (**storage 114**) and a text entry means (**keyboard 12, Fig. 2**) the method comprising:

- a. entering at least one alphanumeric character (see col. 4, lines 49-53; col. 5 lines 25-31 and col. 6 lines 14-16) corresponding to a first text identifier (text identifier is regarded as the command code in col. 2 lines 49-55 and col. 4 lines 48-52) into the text entry device and displaying the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display (see col. 4 lines 34-37 and lines 48-52);
- b. comparing the entered character to data stored in each data source (data source corresponds to data from the keyboard and data from the storage) (see col. 2 lines 36-41 and col. 5 lines 18-26);
- c. displaying, on the monitor, the likely text identifier (see col. 2 lines 42-43);
- d. repeating steps a-c until a desired first text identifier is displayed in the flight plan entry (see col. 5 lines 18-25).

Although Barnett discloses a likely text identifier as in col. 2 lines 42-43, Barnett fails to disclose identifying a likely text identifier **that is geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan**.

Nakhla discloses an alternate destination predictor for aircraft, wherein a likely text identifier that is geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan is identified in col. 5 lines 16-24 and col. 6 lines 57-63.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to implement Nakhla's nearest airport location identification into Barnett's alphanumerical display and data entry method because it would facilitate a pilot to make a better informed decision regarding a route change in case of an emergency, thereby minimizing the probability of crashes due to miscalculated landing distance versus remaining fuel.

**In regard to claim 2,** Barnett fails to specifically disclose the step of accepting the text identifier by the text entry means if acceptable to the aircraft operator and allowing the computer means to modify the aircraft's flight plan corresponding to the accepted text identifier.

Nakhla discloses the step of accepting the text identifier by the text entry means if acceptable to the aircraft operator and allowing the computer means to modify the aircraft's flight plan corresponding to the accepted text identifier (see col. 2 lines 17-27; lines 36-41 and Fig. 4).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to implement Nakhla's flight management modification with Barnett's test entry method because it would facilitate the pilot in the decision making process in case of an emergency by providing a list of alternate destinations at which the pilot can land the airplane.



In regard to claim 11, Barnett discloses a method for entering data into an aircraft avionic flight management system having a computer means (**MCPU 30**) (see col. 2 lines 20-25) the computer means communicating with a monitor (**display 14**) at least one data source (**storage 114**) and a text entry means (**keyboard 12**) the method comprising the steps of:

- entering at least one alphanumeric character (see col. 5 lines 25-31 and col. 6 lines 14-16) corresponding to a first text identifier (which corresponds to the command code in col. 2 lines 49-55 and col. 4 lines 48-52) into the text entry device and displaying the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display (see col. 4 lines 34-37 and lines 48-52);
- comparing the entered character to data stored in each data source (data source corresponds to data from the keyboard and data from the storage) (see col. 2 lines 36-41 and col. 5 lines 18-26);
- displaying, on the monitor, the likely text identifier (see col. 2 lines 42-43);
- repeating steps a-f until all desired text identifiers are displayed in the flight plan entry field (see col. 5 lines 18-25).

Barnett fails to disclose identifying a likely text identifier that is **geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan**. Barnett also fails to disclose entering at least one alphanumeric character corresponding to **additional text identifiers** into the text entry device and displaying the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display.

Furthermore, Barnett fails to disclose the step of accepting the text identifier by the text

Art Unit: 3661

entry means if acceptable to the aircraft operator and allowing the computer means to modify the aircraft's flight plan corresponding to the accepted text identifier.

Nakhla discloses an alternate destination predictor for aircraft, wherein a likely text identifier that is geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan is identified in col. 5 lines 16-24 and col. 6 lines 57-63. Nakhla also discloses entering at least one alphanumeric character corresponding to additional text identifiers into the text entry device and displayed the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display (see col. 5 lines 17-29). Nakhla, further discloses the step of accepting the text identifier by the text entry means if acceptable to the aircraft operator and allowing the computer means to modify the aircraft's flight plan corresponding to the accepted text identifier (see col. 2 lines 17-27; lines 36-41 and Fig. 4)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to implement Nakhla's nearest airport location identification into Barnett's alphanumeric display and data entry method because it would facilitate a pilot to make a better informed decision regarding a route change in case of an emergency, thereby minimizing the probability of crashes due to miscalculated landing distance versus remaining fuel.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Nakhla's flight management modification with Barnett's test entry method because it would facilitate the pilot in the decision making process in case of an emergency by providing a list of alternate destinations at which the pilot can land the airplane.

**In regard to claim 3**, Barnett discloses:

- comparing the entered text to data stored in each data source (data source corresponds to data from the keyboard and data from the storage) (see col. 2 lines 36-41 and col. 5 lines 18-26);
- displaying, on the monitor, the likely text identifier (see col. 2 lines 42-43);
- repeating steps a-c until a desired first text identifier is displayed in the flight plan entry field (see col. 5 lines 18-25).

Barnett fails to disclose entering at least one alphanumeric character corresponding to additional text identifiers into the text entry device and displaying the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display; Barnett also fails to disclose identifying a likely text identifier that is **geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan**. Nakhla discloses an alternate destination predictor for aircraft, having a step of entering at least one alphanumeric character corresponding **to additional text identifiers** into the text entry device and displaying the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display (see col. 5 lines 17-29). Nakhla also discloses identifying a likely text identifier that is **geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan** in col. 5 lines 16-24 and col. 6 lines 57-63.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to implement Nakhla's nearest airport location identification into Barnett's alphanumeric display and data entry method because it would facilitate a pilot to make

a better informed decision regarding a route change in case of an emergency, thereby minimizing the probability of crashes due to miscalculated landing distance versus remaining fuel.

**In regard to claims 4 and 12**, Barnett discloses that at least one data source contains avionic data (see col. 3 lines 28-35).

**In regard to claims 5 and 13**, Barnett discloses that at least one data source contains navigational data (see col. 3 lines 28-35).

**In regard to claims 6 and 14**, Barnett discloses that the computer means is a microprocessor (see col. 8 lines 10-11).

**In regard to claims 7 and 15**, Barnett discloses that each text identifier is selected from the group consisting of airway data (navigation data in col. 5 lines 21-30), waypoint data (see col. 5 lines 28-30) and aircraft procedure data (or landing and destination data in col. 5 lines 21-30 also see Figs. 8 and 9 ).

**In regard to claim 8**, Barnett discloses:

- entering at least one alphanumerical character (see col. 5 lines 25-31 and col. 6 lines 14-16) corresponding to a first text identifier (which corresponds to the command code in col. 2 lines 49-55 and col. 4 lines 48-52) into the text entry

device and displaying the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display (see col. 4 lines 34-37 and lines 48-52);

- comparing the entered character to data stored in each data source (data source corresponds to data from the keyboard and data from the storage) (see col. 2 lines 36-41 and col. 5 lines 18-26);
- displaying, on the monitor, the likely text identifier (see col. 2 lines 42-43);
- repeating steps a-f until all desired text identifiers are displayed in the flight entry field (see col. 5 lines 18-25).

Although Barnett discloses a likely text identifier and entering alphanumeric character as shown above, Barnett fails to specifically disclose identifying a likely text identifier **that is geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan**. Barnett also fails to disclose entering at least one alphanumeric character corresponding **to additional text identifiers** into the text entry device and displaying the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display. Furthermore, Barnett fails to specifically disclose the step of accepting the text identifier by the text entry means if acceptable to the aircraft operator and allowing the computer means to modify the aircraft's flight plan corresponding to the accepted text identifier.

Nakhla, on the other hand, discloses an alternate destination predictor for aircraft, wherein a likely text identifier that is **geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan** is identified in col. 5 lines 16-24 and col. 6 lines 57-63.

Nakhla also discloses entering at least one alphanumeric character corresponding to **additional text identifiers** into the text entry device and displayed the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display (see col. 5 lines 17-29). Nakhla further discloses the step of accepting the text identifier by the text entry means if acceptable to the aircraft operator and allowing the computer means to modify the aircraft's flight plan corresponding to the accepted text identifier (see col. 2 lines 17-27; lines 36-41 and Fig. 4)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to implement Nakhla's nearest airport location identification into Barnett's alphanumeric display and data entry method so that a pilot can make a better informed decision regarding a route change in case of an emergency, thereby minimizing probability of crashes due to miscalculated landing distance versus remaining fuel.

Further, it would also have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to implement Nakhla's flight management modification with Barnett's text entry method because it would facilitate the pilot in the decision making process in case of an emergency by providing a list of alternate destinations at which the pilot can land the airplane.

**In regard to claim 16**, Barnett discloses a system for entering data into an aircraft avionic flight plan, the system comprising an aircraft management system (which correspond to the aircraft control and display apparatus in col. 2

lines 3-4) having a computer means (**MCPU 30**) (see col. 2 lines 20-25) the computer means communicating with a monitor (**display 14**) at least one data source (**storage 114**) and a text entry means (**keyboard 12**) the text entry means configured to accept at least one alphanumeric character (see col. 5 lines 25-31 and col. 6 lines 14-16) corresponding to a first text identifier (test identifier is regarded as command code in col. 2 lines 49-55 and col. 3 lines 48-52), the monitor configured to display the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display (see col. 4 lines 34-37 and lines 48-52) and the computer means configured to compare the entered character to data stored in each data source (data source corresponds to data from the keyboard and data from the storage) (see col. 2 lines 36-41 and col. 5 lines 18-26);

Barnett fails to disclose identifying a likely text identifier that is **geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan.**

Nakhla discloses an alternate destination predictor for aircraft, wherein a likely text identifier that is **geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan** is identified in col. 5 lines 16-24 and col. 6 lines 57-63.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to implement Nakhla's nearest airport location identification into Barnett's alphanumeric display and data entry system so that a pilot can make a better informed decision regarding a route change in case of an emergency, thereby minimizing the probability of crashed due to miscalculated landing distance versus remaining fuel.

**In regard to claim 17**, Barnett discloses displaying, on the monitor, the likely text identifier (see col. 2 lines 42-43).

**In regard to claim 18**, Barnett discloses that the monitor is configured to display the text entered on a flight plan entry field on the display (see col. 4 lines 34-37 and lines 48-52) and the computer means configured to compare the entered character to data stored in each data source (data source corresponds to data from the keyboard and data from the storage) (see col. 2 lines 36-41 and col. 5 lines 18-26).

Barnett fails to specifically disclose that the text entry means is configured to accept at least one entered alphanumeric text character corresponding to additional text identifiers. Barnett also fail to disclose identifying **additional likely text identifiers** that are geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan. Barnett also fails to disclose the modification of the aircraft's flight plan corresponding to the text identifier if acceptable to the aircraft operator.

Nakhla discloses an alternate destination predictor for aircraft, having a text entry means configured to accept at least one entered alphanumeric text character corresponding to additional text identifiers (see col. 5 lines 17-29).

Nakhla also discloses identifying additional likely text identifiers that are geographically closest to the aircraft's flight plan in col. 5 lines 16-24 and col. 6 lines 57-63). Nakhla further discloses that the modification of the aircraft's flight



plan corresponding to the text identifier if acceptable to the aircraft operator (see col. 2 lines 17-27; lines 36-41).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to implement Nakhla's nearest airport location identification into Barnett's alphanumeric display and data entry method so that a pilot can make a better informed decision regarding a route change in case of an emergency, thereby minimizing the probability of crashes due to miscalculated landing distance versus remaining fuel. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Nakhla's flight management modification with Barnett's test entry method because it would facilitate the pilot in the decision making process in case of an emergency by providing a list of alternate destinations at which the pilot can land the airplane.

**In regard to claim 19**, Barnett fails to disclose that the monitor is further configured to display each additional likely text identifier.

Nakhla discloses an alternate destination predictor for aircraft wherein a monitor is further configured to display each additional likely text identifier (see col. 5 lines 16-24 and col. 6 lines 57-63).

It would also have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Nakhla's flight management modification with Barnett's display system because it would facilitate the pilot in the decision making process in

Art Unit: 3661

case of an emergency by providing a list of alternate destinations at which the pilot can land the airplane.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

14. Claims 9 and 10 as renumbered are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims

**In regard to claims 9 and 10**, none of the above-cited references either singularly or in combination teach or fairly disclose:

“removing active runway information from the runway list and sorting and listing all remaining runways by proximity to the active runway on a flight plan entry field on the display”.

15. Claims 20-27 and 28-29 as renumbered are allowable.

**In regard to claims 20-27**, none of the above-cited references either singularly or in combination teach or fairly disclose:

“removing active runway information from the runway list and sorting and listing all remaining runways by proximity to the active runway on a flight plan entry field on the display”.

**In regard to claims 28 and 29**, none of the above-cited references either singularly or in combination teach or fairly disclose:

“if the intercept point is within the new runway’s final approach, allowing the computer means to control an output device to display an error message;

if the intercept point is not within the new runway’s final approach fix, allowing the computer means to control the monitor to display an error message;

if the intercept point is located within the new runway’s final approach fix, allowing the computer means to obtain a new leg corresponding to the new alternate approach and to delete waypoints along the leg which the aircraft has passed;

allowing the computer means to calculate a proposed turn direction and intercept angle for the aircraft to achieve the new intercept point in the new alternate approach and controlling the monitor to display the new alternate approach”.

### ***Conclusion***

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Murray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,842,142) discloses an alternate destination planner for searching a navigation database in an aircraft and identifying a plurality of alternate destinations at which the aircraft can land in the event of an emergency.

Nakhla (U.S. Patent No. 5,398,186) discloses and alternate destination predictor for aircraft.

King et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,692,869) discloses a navigational system and method for creating aircraft navigational guidepoints.

Riley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,503 discloses a method and apparatus using a simplified language consistent with air traffic control syntax for inputting, displaying and controlling the operation of a flight management system of an aircraft to comply with the instructions received by the pilot from the air traffic controller.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marthe Y Marc-Coleman whose telephone number is (703) 305-4970. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9:30 AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William A Cuchlinski can be reached on (703) 308-3873. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Application/Control Number: 09/715,308  
Art Unit: 3661

Page 20

Patent Examiner  
*Marthe Y. Marc-Coleman*  
Marthe Marc-Coleman

May 17, 2002